

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL
SEARCHING AUTHORITY
(SUPPLEMENTARY SHEET)

International File No.: PCT/DE2004/001631

Regarding Point V:

1. This Written Notice includes references to the following documents:

D1: DE 195 26 452 C (DAIMLER BENZ AG) October 10, 1996
(1996-10-10)

D2: US 5,754,123 A (NASHIF PETER JOSEPH ET AL) May 19,
1998 (1998-05-19)

D3: US 5,572,484 A (FRANKE GERHARD ET AL) November 5,
1996 (1996-11-05)

D4: US 5,777,563 A (HULL III WILBUR J ET AL) July 7,
1998 (1998-07-07)

D5: US 5,450,057 A (WATANABE HIROSHI) September 12, 1995
(1995-09-12)

D6: DE 101 60 299 A (BOSCH GMBH ROBERT) June 18, 2003
(2003-06-18)

2. INDEPENDENT CLAIMS 1 AND 14

- 2.1 The present application does not fulfill the requirements of Article 33(1) PCT, because the subject matter of Claim 1 is not novel as defined in Article 33(2) PCT. Document D1 discloses the following (references in brackets refer to that document):

"A device for detecting moving objects present in a blind spot of a vehicle (D1, column 2, lines 23-36), having
- an object detection sensor (D1, Figure)

EV322953483

- which is suitable for detecting the distance to objects moving at a right angle to the direction of travel when the vehicle is backed out of a parking space (D1, column 2, lines 23-36) and lines 42-48; as the detection device set forth in D1 works independently of the direction of travel, it may be assumed that the sensor device also detects vehicles moving at a right angle to the direction of travel, especially as in the case of the indicated lane change maneuver a relative movement at a right angle between the two vehicles takes place) and
- sends the sensor output signals to an evaluation unit,
- the evaluation device determining the relative velocity from the distance sent to it (D1, column 2, lines 36-42)
- and a warning device being switched on as a function of the distance, the relative velocity and velocity of the driver's vehicle to notify the driver of objects moving at a right angle to the driver's vehicle (D1, column 2, lines 42-48)."

2.2 The present application does not fulfill the requirements of Article 33(1) PCT, because the subject matter of Claim 14 is not novel as defined in Article 33(2) PCT. For an analysis of the features of the method, please refer to the remarks regarding Claim 1.

3. DEPENDENT CLAIMS 2 THROUGH 13

3.1 The present application does not fulfill the requirements of Article 33(1) PCT, because the subject matter of Claims 4, 9 and 10 is not novel as defined in Article 33(2) PCT (Claim 4: see D1, column 3, lines 30-34; Claim

9: see D1, column 3, lines 38-39; Claim 10: see D1, column 4, lines 46-52).

3.2 The present application does not fulfill the requirements of Article 33(1) PCT, because the subject matter of Claims 2, 5-8 and 11-13 is not based on an inventive step as defined in Article 33(3) PCT. The features set forth in these claims merely involve various known (see documents D2-D6 and passages indicated in the Search Report) and obvious options which a person skilled in the art would, without any inventive step, choose in order to achieve the object in question in light of the circumstances.

3.3 The combination of features set forth in dependent Claim 3 is not known from the prior art, nor is it to be inferred therefrom.